STANFORD UNIVERSITY MEDICAL CENTER
STANFORD, CALIFORNIA 94305 • (415) 321-1200

STANFORD UNIVERSITY SCHOOL OF MEDICINE
Department of Genetics

November 6, 1969

Senator Gaylord Nelson
Washington, D.C.

Dear Gaylord:

Thank you for sending me word about S. 365, and your kind remarks about my column, in your letter of October 27.

I will be in Washington December 2, and wonder if you might be free that evening for me to use an old raincheck and renew a valued acquaintanceship. I will also have had time to react more concretely to the purposes of S. 365. I have some concern about whether it will end up using more time to get down to brass tacks -- an alternative might be some prescriptions along the lines of the Delaney cancer clause, perhaps more carefully worded.

Enclosed, a series of columns that I would be delighted to see in the record. Please note the release date on the last of them (Nov. 15).

I am hatching my thoughts on further followup, probably on the problems of "zero-tolerance" for residues. I am sure it is no accident that the present law does distinguish residues from additives, if only because the latter can be more directly controlled at the source. Also the ratio between test and exposure levels will undoubtedly span a much wider range, and raise sharper questions about the validity of the cancer clause. Scientifically, zero-tolerance makes no sense unless you mean to ban the original use of an agent, which doubtless should be done for quite a few (e.g. the non-health related applications of DDT).

There are an important 2 documents in this field, that are getting to be hard to find. They are the NRC's publications 749-750 (dated 1960) and have to do with the principles and problems of evaluating additives. They certainly should be in your record, unless the Academy means to reprint them soon.

Yours,
Joshua.
Joshua Lederberg

GAYLORD NELSON